DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 273 SP 005 751

AUTHOR	Weber, Wilford A.; Cooper, James M.
TITLE	Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
REPORT NO	PBTE-Ser-5
PUB DATE	Jun 72
NOTE	30p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Assoc. of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00; quantity discount)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Innovation; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Performance Criteria; *Performance Specifications; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This fictitious scenario embodies all the characteristics and dimensions for a fully developed competency-based teacher education program envisioned by the authors. A single program and its implications for students, faculty, and the institution are presented. Specific areas of the program covered 1) a fundamental description of the competency based teacher education program; 2) objectives of the program; 3) advantages and disadvantages of the program, i.e., personalization, student responsibility, flexibility, choice, and atomization; 4) faculty responsibility; 5) teaching centers concerning pre- and in-service programs, internship; 6) program evaluation; 7) certification and grading; and 8) background leading to the development of this competency based teacher education program. Certain assumptions about solutions to problems that are currently viewed as important weaknesses in performance-based teacher education are based on the authors' judgment. (MJM)

ED 063273

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: A SCENARIO

by Wilford A. Weber
Associate Professor of Education

and

James M. Cooper
Associate Dean

College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

for the AACTE

Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education

PBTE Series: No. 5

June 1972

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite #610
Washington, D. C. 20036

SP 006 121

This paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, through the Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. The opinions expressed herein should not be construed as representing the opinions of the United States Government or the Texas Education Agency.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-81218

Standard Book Number: 910052-67-0

Preface

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is pleased to publish this paper as one of a series sponsored by its Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. The series is designed to expand the knowledge base about issues, problems, and prospects regarding performance-based teacher education as identified in the first publication of the series on the state of the art.[1]

Whereas the latter is a declaration for which the Committee accepts full responsibility, publication of this paper (and the others in the PBTE Series) does not imply Association or Committee endorsement of the views expressed. It is believed, however, that the experience and expertise of these individual authors, as reflected in their writing, are such that their ideas are fruitful additions to the continuing dialogue concerning performance-based teacher education.

In this paper, the authors project a program which incorporates all of the elements and characteristics which they believe are essential to performance-based teacher education programs. The term "competency-based" is viewed by the Committee as synomous with "performance-based," as noted in its state of the art paper.

AACTE acknowledges with appreciation the role of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development of the U. S. Office of Education in the PBTE Project. Its financial support as well as its professional stimulation are major contributions to the Committee's work. The Association acknowledges also the contribution of members of the Committee who served as readers of this paper and of members of the Project staff who assisted in its publication. Special recognition is due J. W. Maucker, chairman of the Committee, and David R. Krathwohl, member of the Committee, for their contributions to the development of the PBTE Series of papers.

Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Director, AACTE

Karl Massanari, Associate Director, AACTE, and Director of AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Project

---

[1]Elam, Stanley, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?," The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Introductory Notes

One of the concerns of the PBTE Committee is the matter of where performance-based teacher education leads. We see certain important weaknesses in available knowledge and techniques. We are concerned with what happens to students, to staff, to curricula, to the whole structure of teacher education. We have commissioned two papers to explore this question. One, *The Manchester Interview* by Ted Andrews of the New York State Department, and the other is this paper by Will Weber and Jim Cooper of the University of Houston. The former is a fictional account of what might happen to a structure of teacher education. The latter looks more closely at a single program and its implications for students, faculty and the institution.

As is obviously necessary in writing a scenario, both papers make certain assumptions about solutions to problems that are currently viewed as important weaknesses in performance-based teacher education. The reader will have to judge for himself whether or not these assumptions are appropriate and whether the assumed consequences would have to follow.

We found this paper, as well as the Andrews paper, mind-expanders and most fascinating exercises. We hope you, as a reader, do also.

David R. Krathwohl, Member of the PBTE Committee and chairman of its Task Force on Commissioning Papers

. . . .

Bits and pieces of the competency-based teacher education movement can be found across the country in a growing number of institutions. To our knowledge, no single program as yet embodies all of the characteristics and dimensions that we envision for a fully developed competency-based teacher education program. The scenario which follows is laid sometime in the future and describes a program that incorporates all those elements we believe to be essential to an integrated, personalized teacher preparation program. We recognize that teacher educators differ and will continue to differ regarding the essential characteristics of competency-based teacher education programs. This scenario reflects our biases--and our hopes.

The inter-office memorandum which follows sets the stage for the scenario.

Wilford A. Weber

James M. Cooper

STATE UNIVERSITY

Inter-Office Memorandum

TO: Teacher Education Faculty FROM: John Clarke, Chairman

SUBJECT: Prospective Faculty Interview DATE: March 12

Jeffrey Craig will be on our campus this Friday interviewing for a position in our department. Mr. Craig comes to us from Midwest University where he is finishing his doctorate in teacher education. While his experiences do not include work in a competency-based program, from my preliminary contacts with him at last month's AACTE meeting, I think Mr. Craig brings expertise which would be particularly useful in our developmental efforts. He has asked to meet both students and faculty during his visit. I do hope all faculty members will have an opportunity to meet with him. As noted in the agenda below, he will be available to meet with faculty from two to three o'clock in the Lounge area. The agenda for his interview is as follows:

8:15	Arrive at airport; met by Dr. Clarke.
9:00-10:00	Meet with Teacher Education Student Advisory Council, Room 412.
10:00-10:30	Coffee break with Dr. Clarke, Lounge.
10:30-11:00	Meet with Dr. Betty Fry, Coordinator of Program Evaluation, Room 320.
11:00-12:00	Tour of campus, Education Building and Learning Resource Center with Dr. Fry.
12:00-1:30	Lunch with Dean Michaels and Faculty-Student Interviewing Committee, Faculty Club.
1:30-2:00	Meet with Drs. Blumberg, Hogan, and Johnson, Room 216.
2:00-3:00	Available to meet with faculty, Lounge Area.
3:00-4:00	Wrap-up with Dr. Clarke, Room 110.

The scenario begins as Jeff Craig and John Clarke arrive at the University and go to the fourth floor of the Education Building.

John: Jeff, we're almost here, so let me give you a copy of your agenda for the day. You said in your letter that you wanted to speak to some of our students as well as our faculty, so I've arranged for you to start by meeting with members of our Teacher Education Student Advisory Council from nine to ten o'clock.

Jeff: The agenda looks good. I'm glad we'll have time to talk at the end of the day--even after talking with all these people on my agenda, I'm sure I'll have plenty of questions left for you at the end of the day.

John: Good. Well, here we are for our nine o'clock meeting with the students. Come on in and I'll introduce you to them.

Jeff: Fine. I'm anxious to meet them and see what they have to say.

John: Good morning, folks. I see you're all here and ready to go. As I told you at our meeting last Wednesday, Mr. Craig is interviewing for a position in the Teacher Education Department. He's expressed a desire to meet with some students while here. I thought you'd be a good group for him to meet. Let me introduce you very briefly and then let you chat. Jeff--I hope you don't mind my introducing you as Jeff; we're very informal here--Jeff, this is Susan Bradley, Maria Gonzales, Howie Springer, Bob Mitchell, and Lou Simmons--our Teacher Education Student Advisory Council. And, this is Jeff Craig, a doctoral student at Midwest University. Have a good session, and, Jeff, I'll be back around ten o'clock to take you for coffee.

Jeff: Thanks, John. I'll see you later. Dr. Clarke has told you I am considering and am being considered for a position here at State U. Your teacher education program has gained a reputation for innovation and from what I have been able to learn from afar, it looks like a program I'd like to be a part of. Journal articles and speeches about it sound promising, but I want to find out what it's like from the student's point of view. After all, you're the ones who have the most to gain or lose from it.

Bob: Fair enough. Let me kick it off by saying that I think the program is really great and it's the competency-based approach that makes it that way. I have a lot of freedom to do my thing and yet I feel that I'm learning to be an effective teacher. I have to be able to demonstrate certain competencies which are a part of being an effective teacher, but don't have to take any particular set of instructional activities. I've got plenty of options as to how I want to learn.

Howie: Bob's right. We aren't required to do anything other than to meet the objectives specified.

Susan: And we have a hand in the specification of those objectives. There are certain objectives which each of us is expected to meet--a kind of central core of generic competencies. The other objectives, while recommended, are negotiable; still others are specified by us based on needs determined by our experiences in the schools.

Jeff: What I hear you saying is that there are certain objectives which are required of each of you, others which are negotiable, and still others which are student-specified. Is that correct?

Howie: Essentially. Even with regard to the required ones, we have the right to negotiate when and where we'll demonstrate competence.

Jeff: You mean you help determine the conditions under which you demonstrate achievement of the objective and when you'll do it?

Howie: Right. For example, one of our required objectives regarding classroom management is that we should be able to work with a classroom group in such a way as to achieve group unity and cooperation. All of us must show our ability to do this, but we can each determine what group of children we will work with and when it is that we wish to be observed and evaluated. I might prefer a group of kids who are ten or eleven years old; somebody else might prefer younger or older kids. Also, I might feel that I'm ready to be assessed relevant to this objective after working with that group for several weeks whereas someone else might feel ready after only a few days, or perhaps not before several months. The point is that the program is primarily achievement-based, not time- or experience-based.

Susan: You see, we are held accountable for achieving objectives, not just for putting in time or for going through certain experiences. Frankly, I like it better than the usual course structure.

Jeff: Are you saying that there are no courses in your program?

Maria: Exactly. We still have some courses outside of the College of Education but there are none in our teacher education program. We have instructional modules instead.

Jeff: Instructional modules? That's a term that has a lot of different meanings. How do you see a module here?

Maria: Well, instructional modules are sets of learning options which are related to an objective or set of objectives. Each of the

learning alternatives is intended to help us meet the objective and each is made available to us, but we don't have to participate in them if we prefer not to. They are there if we want them--resources, not requirements.

Bob: We are even free to design our own alternatives.

Jeff: I can see that this is compatible with the achievement-based notion mentioned earlier. What are some of the advantages--and disadvantages--you see in using modules?

Susan: I see a lot of advantages and not too many disadvantages. First of all, the module approach provides greater flexibility; since modules are smaller than courses, there are more options as to the order in which they can be taken. This provides more opportunities for self-pacing, for independent study, for individualization, and for personalization.

Jeff: Personalization?

Susan: Yes, personalization. The use of modules makes it easier for things to be tailored just for me.

Jeff: What things?

Susan: In some cases, the objectives can be shaped around my needs and abilities, although some objectives are pretty fixed. The assessment procedures are often modified to fit my goals and my abilities. And the instructional alternatives are more likely to provide an option or set of options which more closely fits my learning style then does the linear approach. I also have personal choices I can make regarding certain modules I want to work on.

Howie: I agree with Susan. Greater flexibility is the big plus. Another aspect of the module approach which contributes to flexibility is the nature of pre-assessment procedures. These are generally diagnostic and provide us with an opportunity to be tested out of parts or all of the module. If we can demonstrate that we have already met the objective, we don't have to do anything more; our records show that we have demonstrated mastery relevant to that particular objective, and we go on to the next objectives and the next modules we want to work on.

Jeff: That goes right along with the achievement-based notion. Do you think that the module approach is central to your program?

Bob: It sure is. And another aspect of the instructional module which hasn't been mentioned yet is that you just work away at the objective until you get it. If it takes a day, fine; if

it takes a week, that's O.K., too. When you're finished with a particular module, you can be sure that you've mastered whatever it is that's expected of you--and you've known what was expected right from the beginning. There are no tricks!

Jeff: All I've heard thus far is glowing praise. There must be some problems.

Maria: Well, I had a lot of trouble getting used to modules when I first got into the program. I was used to going to classes and pretty much doing what I was told to do. I just didn't do a very good job of handling the lack of structure--and I wasn't the only one. I was confused by the whole thing; it looked disorganized, and I had a hard time learning that I was responsible for my own learning. I also know that some of us fooled around quite a bit in the beginning. Since we didn't have to go to class, it was easy to just not do anything. It wasn't until about three weeks into the program that we began to talk about this problem in our enabling seminar; most of us began to see that we had to be more responsible.

Jeff: Enabling seminar?

Maria: Yes. Our program has a heavy human relations emphasis. Our initial experience in the program is focused on human relations training--giving and receiving feedback, team development, self-awareness kinds of things. Those of us who wanted to build on those initial experiences--and most of us did--set up weekly seminars with a faculty member of our choice. The seminars--enabling seminars--were intended to provide us with an opportunity to talk about our problems, share ideas, seek help, explore our values, further develop our interpersonal communication skills, and, in short, to provide a home base in a program that has allowed us to go our own way. We have these enabling seminars throughout the entire program.

Jeff: You seem to be suggesting two things, Maria. You've said that some students did a lot of wheel-spinning in the beginning of the program because they weren't familiar with the lack of structure and that the seminar has a positive influence on all students.

Maria: Yes, and I think that the seminar is good in many ways. It sure helps me look at myself--it makes me more aware of myself as a person, as a teacher, and as a member of the teaching profession. It also helps me look at and understand the other people in the program. A very honest and open climate exists in the program and the human relations emphasis has helped to create it.

Jeff: What other advantages or disadvantages are there? Lou, you haven't had your say as yet.

Lou: I guess my greatest complaint is that I don't think everything worth knowing or doing can or should be broken down into objectives. Too much of the meaning is lost and the objective becomes trivial.

Bob: I don't know which modules you've taken, Lou, but many of the modules I've worked on have called for multiple objectives and synthesizing experiences that don't ask everyone to achieve the same objectives. Some of the modules have objectives so broadly defined that the students are expected to come out of the experiences at different points. For example, one module on developing empathy for the inner-city child doesn't ask each student to demonstrate a particular criterion level of empathy. Instead, a number of experiences are provided which hopefully will help the student develop empathy, but everyone comes away from these experiences at a different level.

Maria: In the main, I agree with Bob; but I also think Lou has a point. As long as everyone isn't forced through a funnel and to come out looking and acting like everyone else, I'll be happy. I don't think our program is guilty of that, but I can see where this might be a problem in some programs.

Lou: I guess that I think the program is too atomistic. I'm not sure that I'll be able to integrate all the skills I develop in individual modules into a holistic approach to teaching.

Susan: But that's where the field experiences and intership come in. They're opportunities to put together all the knowledge and skills you've acquired in actual teaching over an extended period of time. I've heard several people say this worked for them.

Bob: One of the things I like is that the program models the approaches we are asked to use in our own teaching. We are learning to use data in making judgments about our teaching. We try to make our plans on the basis of data we have; the teaching strategies and the objectives we use are hypotheses we test during our teaching. Our evaluation procedures allow us to monitor our effectiveness and the growth of our pupils. That's exactly what this program does. That's why it changes as new data become available. That's why such great pains are taken to give us good feedback on how we are doing. That same information is used to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.

Jeff: What you've described implies evaluation and that means adequate measurement. How would you describe those processes?

Howie: Of course, the measurement procedures are always dependent on the nature of the objective. Basically, we are involved in three kinds of objectives--those which have to do with what we know, those which have to do with what we can do, and those which have to do with the impact our teaching has on pupils. In assessing whether or not we have a particular competence, then, assessment can take any one of three general forms: procedures used to see what we know, observation to see how we teach, and pupil growth to see how effective we have been.

Susan: The emphasis in our program has been on the last two of those--our teaching behaviors and our teaching effectiveness. That's one of the things that makes the program different from the usual kind of thing. It also means that we spend much more of our time in schools with children. We have been involved in a progression of field experiences: unstructured and structured observations, tutoring, microteaching, small group instruction, and large group instruction.

Lou: And it looks like some of us will opt to go on into a post-baccalaureate internship and get our Masters' degrees in the program.

Jeff: I'm amazed at how knowledgeable you all are about the philosophy and operations of the program.

Bob: We've all had an extensive orientation to the program--its philosophy, how it operates, and our responsibilities--before we entered the program. We all had a pretty good idea what we were getting into. Things would have been much tougher without a thorough orientation.

Maria: And, of course, we've been trying to incorporate many of these same ideas into our own teaching.

John: I'm sorry to break in on you when it seems things are going so well, but we don't want to wear you out halfway through the morning.

Jeff: I didn't see you there, John; I was engrossed in what your students were telling me. I appreciate their having taken the time to meet with me.

Bob: Glad to do it, and I think I can speak for all of us when I say we enjoyed meeting you.

John: I'd like to thank all of you, too. I hope you didn't scare Jeff too much by telling him about all the mistakes we've made and are making. Thanks again. Jeff, let's walk over to the lounge area and get some coffee.

Jeff: Sounds good. I'm a bit dry from all that talking.

. . . . . .

The scenario shifts to the lounge where John and Jeff are having coffee.

John: What is your reaction to the students?

Jeff: They were an interesting bunch. Honest, outspoken, and knowledgeable. Generally, they were very positive about your program. They didn't voice some of the concerns I've heard from our students at Midwest.

John: Concerns such as what?

Jeff: Well, one of the greatest complaints we received from our students at Midwest was that they wanted more exposure to teaching experiences in the schools. They didn't think that a semester of student teaching in their senior year was adequate. Also, because the student teaching came so late in their college years, some discovered as a result of student teaching that they weren't cut out to be teachers, but they were trapped into teaching if they wanted to graduate on schedule.

John: That's a common complaint at many universities, Jeff. There is no doubt that early awareness experiences in the schools allow our students to test themselves and their commitment to teaching. We believe this testing should be done early enough in a student's college career to allow for other options if he discovers that teaching isn't for him. There is another rationale, however, underlying a competency-based program which argues strongly for early field experiences: if our emphasis is on what the trainee can do and what changes he can bring about in kids, á field setting is necessary. While we can test what a student knows here at the university, we can only see if that knowledge is put into practice to bring about desirable changes in children by a field test with children in a school or in a microteaching situation.

Jeff: Do you mean that many of the professors teach courses out in the schools?

John: Yes, we do that, but we also believe that many of our most skilled practitioners are public school teachers who, with additional training, can and should become part of our teacher education program staff. It's just like having an instructor working with trainees in a clinical setting.

Jeff: Is this what you actually do in your program?

John: Yes. We strongly believe that by locating the responsibility for preparing teachers solely with the university we would deprive our students of resources which should be available to teacher education. To get the schools really involved in teacher education means they must be equal partners in the decision-making process. We can't get that kind of involvement if we at the university still make all the decisions. It just wouldn't work.

Jeff: It sounds good, but what's in it for the schools? Since their primary responsibility is to the children they educate, why should they even want to become so involved in teacher education?

John: There are several reasons. First, the schools are very concerned about their inability to provide meaningful inservice programs for their teachers. They don't have all the talent they need nor do they have budgets large enough to pay for a systematic inservice program. That's where the university comes in. Because the schools are working with us in teacher education, we can justify expending faculty time working with the school teachers on upgrading skills, developing new curricula, and helping them in whatever ways they think appropriate. Second, because we place large numbers of students in particular target or portal schools for early awareness experiences as aides, student teachers, and full-time interns, the school receives many additional personnel to help in the regular curriculum. Third, because the school can count on these additional personnel, they have been able to mix them with regular teachers to form teaching teams that are differentiated according to the functions they perform. For example, one team at Farley Elementary is composed of a senior teacher who is the team leader and who sort of orchestrates the team, a full-time teacher in the district whose specialization is in humanistic or affective education, two interns from the university who are paid one-half a regular teacher's salary, two student teachers, one of whom is particularly strong in reading and the other in math, and five teacher aides who are students enrolled in some of the introductory modules at the university, each of whom spends a half day per week at the school.

Jeff: That's some team. It sounds as complicated as the Oakland Raiders' offense. How many children does this team have responsibility for?

John: About one hundred twenty students. Because they are taught in a large open area and the team is as large and diverse as

it is, there is tremendous flexibility in the curriculum and in the instructional processes.

Jeff: Are the student teachers and interns working on anything in particular? What I mean is, are they just gaining experience or are they working on certain modules during this time?

John: They are all working on modules--and particular objectives--during their field experiences. Most modules call for assessment situations involving demonstration with children. In these cases, the senior teacher of the team has primary responsibility for evaluating the trainees' performance. In fact, many modules were developed almost entirely by teachers, and these represent important competencies they believe the trainees should acquire. The senior teacher also assumes responsibility for assessing the trainees' competencies for these modules. By the way, quite a few of our modules are completed by teachers as a part of the inservice effort of the schools.

Jeff: Most school teachers I know don't have the skills to operate and function the way you're describing these senior teachers.

John: Most of ours didn't until we worked out a training program for them at the Teacher Center. We're very committed to the idea of differentiating the functions of teacher educators according to expertise and willingness to assume responsibilities. For example, some of our staff and our associates in the schools have become specialists in such areas as evaluation, instructional technology, supervision, curriculum development, or instructional material development. This has meant a tremendous staff development effort to develop the competencies necessary to operate our teacher education program with the personnel we have available.

Jeff: You mentioned a Teacher Center. What does that mean in your program?

John: This is a federally funded center designed to provide inservice training for school personnel. It's a joint operation between the state department of education, the university, and the public school system in the city. We've found that it's a beautiful way of creating a preservice-inservice continuum in teacher education.

Jeff: How so?

John: Although the center is designed primarily for inservice teacher education, we are able to tie our undergraduate program into many of the center's activities with the experienced teachers. And since many of the teachers are working with our intern and

student teachers, inservice work with them pays off for our own students. Also, graduates of our program who are hired by the district can continue to receive inservice training through the Teacher Center. I've been talking so much, Jeff, that I forgot I had scheduled you to talk to Dr. Fry at ten-thirty, and it's almost that time now.

Jeff: Who is Dr. Fry?

John: Betty is in charge of our program evaluation and our information processing center. I think you'll like her.

. . . . . .

The scenario moves to Room 320, the office of Dr. Betty Fry.

John: Jeff, I'd like you to meet Betty Fry. Betty, this is Jeff Craig, a prospective faculty member in elementary teacher education.

Betty: I'm very pleased to meet you, Jeff. I met a professor from Midwest, Sam Schwartz, at a meeting last month and he spoke very highly of you.

Jeff: I think a lot of Sam, also. In fact, he was the person who first told me that some exciting things were happening here in teacher education. I understand that you are in charge of evaluation and information processing for the program.

Betty: Sometimes I wonder if I'm in charge of it, or if it's in charge of me.

Jeff: You must be quite busy then. Your role is especially interesting to me because at Midwest there is no equivalent position. Occasionally, follow-up questionnaires are sent to our program graduates, but it certainly isn't enough of a job to warrant a full-time person.

Betty: Actually, Jeff, there are many more people than myself involved in our program evaluation. But to understand why this is so, you have to understand our basic premise; that is, a teacher education program must be capable of assessing how well it has achieved its objectives and must be capable of changing itself based upon the data gathered in the assessment. We are convinced that the validity of the objectives, processes, and components of the program should be viewed as hypotheses to be tested. And, of course, those responsible for making decisions must have access to data which permit them to maintain elements of the program which warrant maintenance and to change elements which warrant change. In other words, we believe that teacher

education programs must utilize evaluation feedback systems which provide formative data useful to program planners.

Jeff: I agree wholeheartedly with that philosophy, but what kinds of data do you collect?

John: You name it, Jeff, and Betty and her people collect it.

Betty: Actually, we collect both formative data while the program is ongoing and summative data on our graduates once they have left the preservice part of the program.

Jeff: What kind of formative data?

Betty: Oh, feedback from students and professors regarding how well they like particular modules and what changes they would suggest to improve them, whether the instructional processes for each module are enabling the large majority of students to achieve the objectives of the module, and cost-effectiveness data of particular modules and related instructional activities.

Jeff: What do you mean by "cost-effectiveness" data?

Betty: For example, some instructional processes such as computer-assisted instruction are expensive to develop and operate. If relatively few students are choosing this instructional alternative, then we need to know that in order to decide whether or not it's worth it to continue to offer CAI as an alternative. We also need to know which instructional alternatives are effective and which are not.

Jeff: You said that you followed up on your graduates after they left the program. What kind of data are you looking for?

Betty: Primarily, we are trying to find out if our graduates can perform competently in actual classroom and school settings. This means that we gather data to see if they function on the job as they were trained, and we see if they can integrate the skills they acquired into a style with which they're comfortable--and effective.

Jeff: Where do you get all this data?

Betty: Well, we gather evaluations from pupils, colleagues, principals, and parents. We also collect sample videotapes of their teaching in order to analyze them for evidence of the teaching skills they were taught in their training program.

John: Don't forget about the checklist.

Betty: Right. Thanks for reminding me, John. We provide the graduates with checklists of the various modules and their objectives and ask them to assess whether they used any of the skills and knowledge contained in these modules in the last week. This is done periodically so we can obtain the graduates' perceptions of what modules were and were not useful to them. We can then use this data to make decisions about program changes.

Jeff: Isn't this type of evaluation threatening to the instructors?

Betty: Frankly, Jeff, it is to some of our faculty, but we try not to use these data in a negative sense. Instead, we use it as feedback to the program developers and instructors so they can try to upgrade the program. Although there isn't time to visit any of our schools, Jeff, would you like to visit some of our facilities on campus?

Jeff: I think you must have read my mind. That's exactly what I was going to ask you.

Betty: Good. Let's go to the Learning Resource Center, then. John, would you like to join us?

John: I'd like to, but I still have some work I have to catch up on. I'll see you later this afternoon, though.

. . . . . .

The scenario moves to the Learning Resource Center.

Betty: This is our Learning Resource Center, Jeff, where most of the instructional materials for modules which are self-instructional are located. At these carrels the students can study after checking out the materials they are working on. Some of the carrels have videotape playback units, others have record players or screens for viewing slide-tape presentations or films.

Jeff: When the students have finished working with the instructional materials, how do you find out if they've achieved the objectives of the module?

Betty: That depends on what kind of assessment is called for. If knowledge is being assessed, we generally give a written or oral test. If the assessment calls for some kind of performance, such as questioning techniques, the instructor responsible for the module will schedule microteaching or actual teaching experiences where the trainee's performance can be assessed. The same is true if the objective requires the trainee to bring about certain changes on the part of pupils he teaches.

Jeff: Isn't this rather complicated?

Betty: Yes, indeed. In fact, many of our resources go into program management because nothing turns both faculty and students off faster than being hampered by poor administration and management. Poor logistical support can really hurt the program.

Student: Hello, Dr. Fry.

Betty: Well, hello, Kendra. Jeff, I'd like you to meet Kendra Temple, one of our students. Kendra, this is Mr. Jeffrey Craig, a prospective faculty member.

Kendra: I'm pleased to meet you, Mr. Craig.

Jeff: How do you do, Kendra? I'm pleased to meet you. I had the opportunity this morning to talk to some other students about the teacher education program, but a couple of other questions have occurred to me since that time. Maybe you could answer them?

Kendra: Sure. What, in particular, would you like to know?

Jeff: Why don't you tell me a little bit about yourself first?

Kendra: O.K. I'm an elementary education major specializing in the dynamics of instructional groups.

Jeff: The dynamics of instructional groups? That's unusual. I didn't realize that was a specialization area here. How did you happen to choose that?

Kendra: I got interested in small group instruction after I had taken some initial modules in that area. When I found out that I could specialize in group dynamics, I decided that was what I wanted to do.

Jeff: Are there any troubles getting certified as an instructional group specialist?

Kendra: Actually, I'll be certified as an elementary school teacher, but I'll be especially trained in the use of small and large groups.

Betty: Excuse me, you two, I'm going to check on some materials at the checkout desk. I'll be back in a few minutes.

Jeff: Fine, Betty. Kendra, how will a school district find out about your specialty when you are job-hunting? Will the state department of education inform them?

Kendra: No, they won't. What happens is that each of us in the program has a portfolio which contains a record of the competencies we have demonstrated, in addition to evaluations by the cooperating teachers and university personnel. When one of us applies for a job, the placement service sends the portfolio to the school district, and the district can determine if that teacher's competencies are what they need for their program.

Jeff: How does state certification fit into this picture?

Kendra: Well, as I understand it, our university has received program approval from the state department of education because we have developed a competency-based program. Certification used to be based on whether or not a student had taken certain specified courses. Now the state department allows more flexibility in the makeup of the programs of individual students. The main thing the state requires is that the competencies to be acquired and the procedures used for assessing the competencies be described. There are some other requirements about who has to participate in the design of the program, but I'm not sure exactly what they are.

Jeff: I'm curious about the grading system used in the program. How do these modules fit in with regular semester hours of credit?

Kendra: Well, each module is assigned so many modular credits, which are fractions of a semester hour of credit. When the student completes fifteen modular credits, he is given one semester hour of credit. That way, the College doesn't create problems for the university registrar, since the rest of the university still operates on a course basis where most courses are worth three semester hours of credit.

Jeff: Do you get letter grades on each module?

Kendra: No, letter grades have been replaced by a Pass-No Record system for each module. If the student meets the criteria for competency in a module, he gets credit for it but no grade. If the student doesn't pass, then nothing is entered in his permanent record. The emphasis is on success, on what you achieve, not on your failures.

Jeff: How do you and most of your friends like this approach?

Kendra: Most of them really like it because there is less pressure put upon the student. Students who can't be responsible for their own learning have some problems, but counseling is available for any student who has this or other kinds of problems. Another problem with the system is that because the rest of the university is still on the old grading system, if a student gets some poor grades in some of these courses, he can't use his marks from

his Education modules to raise his cumulative average. As it turns out, your cumulative average is based solely on work outside your major. This has created some graduation problems for some students.

Jeff: I can see where that would be bad. Would you like to return to the old grading system in Education?

Kendra: Oh, no. I wish the rest of the university would drop its grading system. Having two grading systems in operation at the same time poses problems, but I'm glad the College uses the system it does.

Betty: Jeff, it we're going to see the rest of the building and meet Dean Michaels for lunch, we had better get going.

Jeff: Well, Kendra, thanks for taking the time to talk to me. One last question; do you like the program?

Kendra: Some of my friends at other institutions have described their teacher education programs to me and that's when I really appreciate our program here. We've got our share of problems, but I think it's great.

Jeff: That's what I gather from your enthusiasm. Thanks, again.

Kendra: You're welcome. I enjoyed talking to you. Goodbye.

. . . . . .

The scenario shifts to Room 110, Dr. Clarke's office, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

John: Well, Jeff, you've had a busy day. One day isn't very much time to spend looking at our program, our faculty, and our students, but I hope you've gotten a feel for things now.

Jeff: I think I have.

John: I'm sure we haven't answered all of your questions; there must be quite a bit you'd still like to know.

Jeff: Yes, there are several things. How did all of this get started? What prompted this developmental effort?

John: To be perfectly honest, our initial efforts grew out of a rather general dissatisfaction with our teacher education program. Many of us felt that we had a lot of good ideas and a lot of good program pieces which didn't fit together.

Jeff: Good pieces?

John: Yes, good pieces. Innovative practices. Program elements like microteaching, interaction analysis, a clinical approach to supervision, independent study opportunities, an inner-city tutoring program. We felt that these and other things we were doing were yielding positive results, but they never fit together in a way which gave us maximum payoff. So we began to look around for ways in which to put those pieces--and any others which made sense--into a program design which was based on careful planning and not just tradition. We hacked at that for a while and felt that we really were just repackaging our product without improving it. We finally found that some of our basic assumptions about teacher education needed rethinking if we were to get out of the rut we were in.

Jeff: What assumptions were those?

John: There were many, but let me just talk about some of the major ones. We looked at our curriculum and found that we were organized around separate subject areas, but many of the things we wanted students to learn did not fit within the framework of a single subject area.

Jeff: I'm afraid I don't follow you.

John: Let me give you an example. All of our students were required to take a three-credit course called "Human Growth and Development." Depending upon what section a student happened to get, his instructor would be either an ed. psych. person or a child psych. person. The ed. psych. instructors generally put greatest emphasis on the intellectual and emotional growth of the child and would usually focus on the teacher's role in facilitating that growth. On the other hand, our child development people emphasized physical and social growth and the role of the home. Furthermore, no matter what the emphasis, all of this was done in a nice, neat three-semester-hour course.

Jeff: But this is a common problem. Instructors always have their pet topics--and those are the areas in which they are generally best.

John: True enough, Jeff. And in an effort to capitalize on this, we have built a curriculum which is based on specific competencies generated from a well-conceptualized model of the teacher's role rather than one which is a composite of distinct subjects.

Jeff: You've lost me again. Could you go back to our example from human growth and development?

John: Sure. What we did was to try to determine what it is that we want children to be and to become. Then we tried to ascertain the ways in which teachers could contribute to that process; that is, to look at the teacher behaviors, attitudes, and

understandings which would facilitate pupil growth--intellectually, socially, emotionally, and physically. Where research evidence was lacking, we drew on the theoretical concepts we thought were best. Thus, using a pluralistic approach, we identified what we felt were the competencies an effective teacher ought to have. As someone has probably already mentioned, we felt then--and we feel now--that the particular set of competencies we have specified are largely untested assumptions which our program is testing. From those competencies which we felt were important, we generated specific instructional objectives.

Jeff: I think I'm with you but could you relate that to our example?

John: O.K. What we did here was to have our ed. psych. people and our child psych. people look at all the competencies which had been identified--indeed, which they had helped to identify--and had them generate objectives out of those they felt were concerned with their areas of expertise. The ed. psych. people focused most directly on the intellectual and emotional aspects of human development while the child development people were more concerned with social and physical aspects. Where there was overlap, they simply generated an objective agreeable to both groups. They also spent a great deal of time searching for gaps in the curriculum.

Jeff: Gaps?

John: Yes, objectives which each had neglected because they mistakenly thought that this would be covered by someone else, somewhere else.

Jeff: This must have been a long process. Did it really improve the curriculum much?

John: It was a lengthy process and a great deal of work, but we feel there were several big improvements. First, the curriculum was developed from a well-developed conception of the teacher's role as a facilitator of pupil growth. Secondly, the approach was systematic and interdisciplinary; consequently, gaps and overlaps could be designed away. Thirdly, instructional objectives became a function of empirically and theoretically derived knowledge rather than the thinking of an individual instructor. And lastly, the process got all of the faculty--and public school personnel--involved in looking at the curriculum and their various roles as teacher educators.

Jeff: Do the faculty members like the outcome?

John: I think so. Each can now concentrate his efforts in an area with which he is comfortable and in which he has greatest expertise; that is, this approach has helped us to differentiate our staff

in new ways. Also, we had the benefits which come from the utilization of instructional modules.

Jeff: I've heard a great deal about instructional modules today. You've looked at the notion quite broadly here, haven't you?

John: Yes, we have. An instructional module, as we view it, is not necessarily independent study material or programmed learning as in some places. It may involve a whole raft of instructional activities focused on a particular objective or set of objectives. It isn't necessarily a tidy package to be placed in the Learning Resource Center. Many are field-centered.

Jeff: The comments of your students have helped me see that your modules are built around objectives rather than activities. So I can see how the learning activities could be very diversified.

John: Exactly. Well, Jeff, if you're going to catch your plane out of here, I had better get you to the airport. I'd like to say that it has been our pleasure to have you on campus today. We've tried to show you what it is that we're about--to show you a program we feel you may want to be a part of. What do you think, Jeff. Do you want to sign on?

Scene fades on Jeff's muffled reply.

The Texas Teacher Center Project

The AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education serves as the national component of the Texas Teacher Center Project. This Project was initiated in July, 1970, through a grant to the Texas Education Agency from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE. The Project was initially funded under the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program and the national component was subcontracted by the Texas Education Agency to AACTE.

One of the original thrusts of the Texas Teacher Center Project was to conceptualize and field test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base. By the inclusion of the national component in the Project, the Texas Project made it possible for all efforts in the nation related to performance-based teacher education to gain national visibility. More important, it gave to the nation a central forum where continuous study and further clarification of the performance-based movement might take place.

While the Texas Teacher Center Project is of particular interest to AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Committee, the services of the Committee are available, within its resources, to all states, colleges and universities, and groups concerned with the improvement of preparation programs for school personnel.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national voluntary association of colleges and universities organized to improve the quality of instructional programs of teacher education. All types of four-year institutions for higher education are represented in the present membership. These include private and church-related liberal arts colleges, state teachers colleges, state colleges, state universities, private and church-related universities, and municipal universities. The teacher education programs offered by member institutions are varied. One theme dominates AACTE activities -- the dedication to ever-improving quality in the education of teachers.

AACTE carries out its program through the voluntary services of representatives from member institutions, a full-time professional staff at the Headquarters Office, and continuing commissions and ad hoc task forces. Projects and activities are developed to implement Association objectives. The Annual Meeting, held in February, considers current issues in teacher education and Association business as well as the development of acquaintances within the membership. Biennially, the AACTE sponsors a week-long School for Executives which provides an opportunity for concentrated professional attention to specific problems concerned with institutional teacher education programs. An important program of publications supplements the AACTE meetings and committee work. By means of the BULLETIN the Association serves as a clearing-house of information concerning the education of teachers. As a member of the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education, (AOTE), the AACTE works in a coordinated effort to improve the education of teachers. Through the Advisory Council of the AOTE, the cooperating groups are represented on the Board of Directors of the AACTE. A Consultative Service assists member institutions in working with specific teacher education problems.

The Association is a constituent member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and as such provides valuable institutional backing for the Council's accrediting program. The AACTE provides important financial support for NCATE. Member institutions that are accredited do not pay a separate yearly accrediting fee, inasmuch as this is covered by the Association's yearly contribution to the NCATE.

PROPOSED FUTURE PUBLICATIONS IN THE PBTE SERIES

- A description and analysis of seventeen performance-based teacher education programs by Iris Elfenbein, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

- A scenario of how performance-based teacher education programs might look in the future by Asahel Woodruff, University of Utah.

- Problems in assessing teaching performance by Fred McDonald, Educational Testing Service.

- A look at the humanistic elements in performance-based teacher education programs by Paul Nash, University of California at Santa Barbara.

- The implications of broadening the base for decision making in teacher education by Michael Kirst, Stanford University.

- Two papers on the implications of operating performance-based teacher education programs in minority group settings: one by Joseph Durham, Howard University, and the other by Rupert Trujillo, New Mexico State University.

- Management of performance-based teacher education programs by Charles Johnson, University of Georgia.

- Alternative curricular designs for performance-based teacher education programs by Bruce Joyce, Teachers College, Columbia University.

The Series will be available for distribution in the near future. Communication should be addressed to Karl Massanari, director, AACTE PBTE Project, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

AACTE PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: *J. W. Maucker*, Assistant to the President for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Office, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801

VICE-CHAIRMAN: *Donald J. McCarty*, Dean, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

William W. Barr, Student, School of Education, University of Denver, Denver Colorado 80210

Elbert Brooks, Superintendent of Schools, Metropolitan Schools, 2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Patrick L. Daly, Social Studies Teacher, Edsel Ford High School, 20601 Rotunda Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48124

K. Fred Daniel, Associate for Planning and Coordination, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304

William H. Drummond, Associate for Teacher Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington 98501

Tommy Fulton, Art Teacher, Jarman Jr. High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110

William A. Jenkins, Dean, School of Education, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207

Lorrin Kennamer, Dean, College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712

David Krathwohl, Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210

Margaret Lindsey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

Donald M. Medley, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Youra Qualls, Head, Humanities Division, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Atilano Valencia, Associate Professor in Education and Assistant Dean in Mexican-American Research Program, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302

Paul Varg, Professor of History, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Theodore Andrews, Associate in Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York 12204 (Multi-State Consortium)

Norman Dodl, Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (Elementary Education Model Program Directors)

Harlan Ford, Assistant Commissioner of Education (or *Tom Ryan*) Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas 78701

Norman Johnson, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Southern Consortium)

Kyle Killough, Director, Texas Education Renewal Center, 6504 Tracor Lane, Austin, Texas 78721 (Texas Teacher Center Project)

Donald Orlosky, Professor of Education and Associate Director of Leadership Training Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620 (Leadership Training Institute)

Benjamin Rosner, University Dean of Teacher Education, Office of Teacher Education, the City University of New York, 1411 Broadway (Room 1119), New York, New York 10018 (Task Force '72 Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education)

Allen Schmieder, Director, Program Thrust '72 Task Force, Bureau of Education Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202 (Office of Education)

Emmitt Smith, Vice President, Program Development and Resources, West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas 79015 (Texas Teacher Center Project)

STAFF:

Karl Massanari, Director
Albert Plouffe, Assistant Director
Shirley Bonneville, Program Assistant
Brenda Greenhowe, Secretary
Janice Chapman, Secretary

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM FOR PBTE PAPERS

Number of Copies	PBTE Series	Titles
____	#1	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" by Stan Elam @ $2.00 per copy
___	#2	"The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College" by Caseel Burke @ $2.00 per copy
____	#3	"Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/Certification" by Theodore Andrews @ $2.00 per copy
____	#4	"A Critique of PBTE" by Harry S. Broudy @ $2.00 per copy
____	#5	"Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario" by James Cooper and Wilford Weber @ $2.00 per copy
____	#6	"Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University" by Frederic T. Giles and Clifford Foster @ $3.00 per copy

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.
DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchases of five or more publications of any one title. Also, a 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed ____ Bill me ____ Amount _____
Purchase Order No._____

NAME_____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS_____

_____ZIP_____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite # 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

ORDER FORM FOR RECENT AACTE PUBLICATIONS

Number of Copies	Titles
_____	"The Profession, Politics, and Society" (1972 Yearbook) Volume I and Volume II @ $6.00
_____	Volume I (Proceedings) Only @ $4.00
_____	Volume II (Directory) Only @ $3.00
_____	"Power and Decision Making in Teacher Education" (1971 Yearbook) @ $6.00
_____	"What Kind of Environment Will Our Children Have?" @ $2.50
_____	"Social Change and Teacher Education" @ $2.50
_____	"Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education" @ $3.25
_____	"Excellence in Teacher Education" (Limited Supply) @ $1.00
_____	"Beyond the Upheaval" @ $1.00
_____	"In West Virginia, It Is Working" @ $2.00
_____	"Educational Personnel for the Urban Schools: What Differentiated Staffing Can Do" @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.
DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchases of five or more publications of any one title. Also, a 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed_____ Bill me_____ Amount_____
Purchase Order No. _____

NAME_____
(Please type or print)

ADDRESS_____

_____ZIP_____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036